



INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
ATLANTA • PHILADELPHIA • SEATTLE

FACSIMILE

DATE: August 22, 2008

JOB CODE:

OFFICIAL PAPER

Please deliver this and the following pages to:

Examiner: **Giovanna B. Colan**
U.S.P.T.O. Group Art Unit: **2162**
Telecopier No.: **(571) 273-2752**
U.S. Serial No.: **10/821,687**
Client/Matter No.: **MSFT-2955/307064.01**
Sender's Name: **Bryan T. Giles**
Pages to Follow: **10**

If transmission is not complete, please call our **Philadelphia Office** at **(215) 568-3100**.

COVER MESSAGE:

OFFICIAL FACSIMILE. PLEASE DELIVER TO EXAMINER IMMEDIATELY.

Attached hereto are the following documents:

- 1) Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form
- 2) Proposed Claim Amendments

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERY OF THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
A Partnership Including Professional Corporations
www.woodcock.com

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/821,687 First Named Applicant: F. Soner Terak
Examiner: Colan Art Unit: 2162 Status of Application: Pending (Final)

Tentative Participants:

(1) Bryan T. Giles (2) Examiner Colan
(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: Anytime during week of 8/25 Proposed Time: 2:00 EST AM PM

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated:

☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>§103 rejection</u>	<u>Claims 38, 49, 53, 55</u>	<u>Berman</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:

see proposed claim amendments & discussion
on continuation sheet

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Bryan T. Giles

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

60,078

Registration Number, if applicable

Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-5199 and select option 2.

PROPOSED CLAIM AMENDMENTS

(**DO NOT ENTER**)

1 – 37. (Canceled)

38. (Currently amended) A computer readable medium bearing a computer readable representation of an object, wherein said object comprises primitive and non-primitive members, and wherein said object is serialized for retrieval by computer hardware, the computer readable representation comprising:

a binary fragment associated with said object, said binary fragment comprising a binary fragment header and a binary fragment payload, wherein the binary fragment payload ~~comprises all~~ includes a plurality of primitive data members of said object, and wherein the binary fragment payload is devoid of any non-primitive members of said object; and
at least one additional fragment comprising at least one non-primitive member of said object.

wherein said plurality of primitive data members in the binary fragment payload represent all of the primitive data members associated with said object.

wherein said plurality of primitive data members are in a storage engine record format, [[:]]

wherein the binary fragment header comprises a type field and a length field, and [[:]]

~~wherein said primitive data members comprise only members of a primitive data type, said primitive data type comprising at least integers and excluding at least collections; and~~

wherein the type field indicates that the binary fragment payload is devoid of any non-primitive data members.

~~at least one additional fragment comprising at least one non-primitive member of the object.~~

39. (Canceled)

40. (Currently amended) The computer readable medium of claim 38, wherein said at least one additional fragment comprises:

at least one Large Object (LOB) fragment comprising a LOB fragment header and a LOB fragment payload₁[[:]]

wherein the LOB header comprises a LOB type field, a value type field, and a LOB length field₁[[:]]

wherein the LOB type field indicates the LOB fragment is a LOB fragment₁[[:]]

wherein the value type field indicates whether the LOB fragment payload comprises an inline LOB or a pointer to a LOB location, and[[:]]

wherein the LOB length field indicates a length of the LOB fragment payload.

41. (Previously presented) The computer readable medium of claim 40, wherein the LOB fragment payload comprises a LOB.

42. (Previously presented) The computer readable medium of claim 40, wherein the LOB fragment payload comprises a pointer to a LOB location.

43. (Previously presented) The computer readable medium of claim 40, wherein the value type field indicates whether the LOB fragment payload comprises an inline LOB, a pointer to a LOB location, or a cell reference.

44. (Previously presented) The computer readable medium of claim 38, further comprising a terminator fragment that marks the end of the object, said terminator fragment comprising a terminator type field indicating the terminator fragment is a terminator fragment.

45. (Currently amended) The computer readable medium of claim 38, wherein said at least one additional fragment comprises:

a collection start fragment comprising a collection start header₁[[:]]

wherein the collection start header comprises a collection start type field and a bit field₁[[:]]

wherein the collection start type field indicates the collection start fragment is a collection start fragment, and[[:]]

wherein the bit field indicates whether an order exists among a plurality of collection element fragments.

46. (Currently amended) The computer readable medium of claim 45, further comprising:

at least one collection element fragment comprising a collection element header and collection element payload₁[[;]]

wherein the collection element header comprises a collection element type field and a collection element length field₁[[;]]

wherein the collection element type field indicates the collection element fragment is a collection element fragment, and[[;]]

wherein the collection element length field indicates the a length of the collection element payload.

47. (Previously presented) The computer readable medium of claim 46, wherein the collection element payload comprises a data member in a collection of data members corresponding to said collection start fragment.

48. (Previously presented) The computer readable medium of claim 46, wherein the collection element header further comprises a collection element locator field that provides a unique location of a data member in a collection of data members.

49. (Currently amended) A computer readable medium bearing a computer readable representation of an object that is serialized for efficient retrieval by computer hardware, the computer readable representation comprising:

at least one Large Object (LOB) fragment comprising a LOB fragment header and a LOB fragment payload₁[[;]]

wherein the LOB header comprises a LOB type field, a value type field, and a LOB length field₁[[;]]

wherein the LOB type field indicates the LOB fragment is a LOB fragment₁[[;]]

wherein the value type field indicates whether the LOB fragment payload comprises an inline LOB or a pointer to a LOB location, and[:;]

wherein the LOB length field indicates a length of the LOB fragment payload;

a collection start fragment comprising a collection start header,[:;]

wherein the collection start header comprises a collection start type field and a bit field,[:;]

wherein the collection start type field indicates the collection start fragment is a collection start fragment, and[:;]

wherein the bit field indicates a property of a collection in one of a plurality of collection element fragments,

wherein the bit field further indicates whether an order exists among [[a]] the plurality of collection element fragments; and

the [[a]] plurality of collection element fragments associated with said collection start fragment,

wherein each of said the plurality of collection element fragments comprising comprises a collection element header and a collection element payload, and

wherein each collection element payload comprises ~~only~~ a data member of a collection element data type, said collection element data type comprising data of a same type as every collection element associated with said collection start fragment.

50-53. (Canceled)

54. (Currently amended) The computer readable medium of claim 49,

wherein the collection element header comprises a collection element type field and a collection element length field,[:;]

wherein the collection element type field indicates the collection element fragment is a collection element fragment, and[:;]

wherein the collection element length field indicates a length of the collection element payload.

55. (Currently amended) A computer readable medium bearing a computer readable representation of an object that is serialized for efficient retrieval by computer hardware, the computer readable representation comprising:

a collection start fragment comprising a collection start header₁[[:]]

wherein the collection start header comprises a collection start type field and a bit field₁[[:]]

wherein the collection start type field indicates the collection start fragment is a collection start fragment₁[[:]]

wherein the bit field indicates a property of a collection in one of a plurality of collection element fragments, and

wherein the bit field further indicates whether an order exists among [[a]] the plurality of collection element fragments; and

the [[a]] plurality of collection element fragments associated with said collection start fragment, each of said collection element fragments comprising a collection element header and a collection element payload,

wherein each collection element payload comprises only a data member of a collection element data type, said collection element data type comprising data of a same type as every collection element associated with said collection start fragment₁[[:]]

wherein the collection element header comprises a collection element type field and a collection element length field₁[[:]]

wherein the collection element type field indicates the collection element fragment is a collection element fragment₁, and[[:]]

wherein the collection element length field indicates the a length of the collection element payload.

56. (Canceled)

57. (Previously presented) The computer readable medium of claim 55, wherein the collection element header further comprises a collection element locator field that provides a unique location of a data member in a collection of data members.

58. (Currently amended) A computer readable medium bearing a computer readable representation of an object that is serialized for efficient retrieval by computer hardware, the computer readable representation comprising:

a binary fragment associated with said object, said binary fragment comprising a binary fragment header and a binary fragment payload, wherein the binary fragment payload ~~comprises all~~ includes a plurality of primitive data members of said object and is devoid of any non-primitive members of said object, and

wherein said plurality of primitive data members in the binary fragment payload represent all of the primitive data members associated with said object,

wherein said plurality of primitive data members are in a storage engine record format,[[;]]

wherein the binary fragment header comprises a type field and a length field, and[[;]]

~~wherein said primitive data members comprise only members of a primitive data type, said primitive data type comprising at least integers and excluding at least collections; and~~

wherein the type field indicates that the binary fragment is the only fragment of the object and that the binary fragment payload is devoid of any non-primitive data members.

DISCUSSION

Independent Claim 38

Independent claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,634,123 (“Bennion”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,673 (“Hong”). Without conceding the merits of the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 38 to further clarify the claimed subject matter.

As amended, claim 38 recites, in part, a binary fragment associated with an object. The binary fragment includes a binary fragment header and a binary fragment payload. The binary fragment payload is devoid of any non-primitive members of the object. The binary fragment header includes a type field *that indicates that the binary fragment payload is devoid of any non-primitive data members*. The Office Action contends that the code point 202 found at each of Bennion’s records corresponds to the recited binary fragment header (*see* Office Action dated March 21, 2008 (“Office Action”) at p. 5). Applicants respectfully disagree.

More specifically, Bennion discloses a data format that includes, *inter alia*, a code point 202 (Bennion at FIG. 2). Bennion’s code point 202 is two bytes long (*id.* at col. 5, line 13). One bit is used to indicate whether the data format corresponds to a container record 200 or a data-containing record 201 (*id.* at col. 5, lines 18-19). The other bit is free (*id.* at col. 5, line 20). Thus, Bennion’s code point 202 does not indicate that the data format is devoid of any non-primitive data members. Rather, Bennion’s code point 202 indicates whether the data format contains records or data.

Hong is cited in the Office Action as allegedly disclosing a “primitive data type comprising at least integers” (*see* Office Action at p. 5). Thus, the alleged teachings of Hong do not cure the foregoing deficiencies in the teachings of Bennion.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 38 patentably defines over Bennion and Hong. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claim 58

Independent claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennion in view of Hong and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,130 (“Roy”).

Like claim 38, claim 58 also has been amended to recite a binary fragment header that has a type field for indicating that a binary fragment payload of a binary fragment is devoid of any non-primitive data members.

Roy is cited in the Office Action as allegedly teaching a type field that the binary fragment is the only fragment of an object (*see* Office Action at p. 25). Thus, the alleged teachings of Roy do not cure the foregoing deficiencies in the teachings of Bennion and Hong noted above.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 58 patentably defines over Bennion, Hong and Roy. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent claim 49

Independent claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennion in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0220946 (“Krishnaprasad”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,012,067 (“Sarkar”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,904,454 (“Stickler”). Without conceding the merits of the rejection, Applicants have amended claim 49 to further clarify the claimed subject matter.

As amended, claim 49 recites, in part, a collection start fragment having a collection start header. The collection start header includes a bit field *that indicates a property of a collection that is in at least one or more other fragments*. The Office Action contends that the code point 202 found at each of Bennion’s records corresponds to the recited collection start fragment (*see* Office Action at p. 29). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As noted above, Bennion’s code point 202 is used to indicate whether a data format corresponds to a container record 200 or a data-containing record 201. Thus, Bennion’s code point 202 does not indicate a property of a collection that is in another record.

Krishnaprasad is cited in the Office Action as allegedly teaching a large object (LOB) fragment (*see* Office Action at p. 17). Sarkar is cited in the Office Action as allegedly teaching a value type field that indicates whether a payload of the LOB fragment includes an inline LOB or a pointer to a LOB location (*id.* at p. 18). Stickler is cited in the Office Action as allegedly teaching a bit field that indicates whether an order exists among two or more collection element fragments (*id.* at p. 19). Thus, the alleged teachings of Krishnaprasad, Sarkar and Stickler do not supply the missing teachings of Bennion.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 49 patentably defines over Bennion, Krishnaprasad, Sarkar and Stickler. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claim 55

Independent claim 55 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennion in view of Hong and in further view of Stickler. The subject matter of claim 49 discussed above is similarly recited in claim 55. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 55 patentably defines over Bennion, Hong and Stickler for at least the same reasons as claim 49. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).